



## **EXHIBIT 8**

### **Marcel Moreau Deposition Excerpts**

- Pages 187-188, 200, 204, 767, 773-774, 780 from the deposition testimony of Marcel Moreau, taken April 4, 2012 and April 11, 2012.

Marcel G. Moreau

Page 186	Page 188
<p>1 A. I don't have any record specific to 2 a spill bucket, and I don't see any permit 3 applications. A permit would have been required 4 if the work was done. I don't know exactly when 5 that would have started. Sometime in the early 6 '90s, if not sooner. So the available evidence 7 indicates or doesn't indicate that a spill bucket 8 was added to this facility in the 1990 time frame 9 or any time in the 1990's.</p> <p>10 Q. So there is soil contamination in 11 the vicinity of the tank area, and the precise 12 cause of that contamination cannot be identified 13 because of the lack of documentation in the 14 records as they exist today?</p> <p>15 MS. O'REILLY: Vague and ambiguous. 16 Go ahead.</p> <p>17 A. As far as the records that I have 18 reviewed, there are no records that point to 19 specific releases associated with what I would 20 call the tank area. There is contaminated soil, 21 so something happened in the area. The records 22 of what those events might be are not present in 23 the record.</p> <p>24 Q. With regard to the piping and 25 dispenser area releases, there is a reference to</p>	<p>1 formed in this case, is it your opinion that a 2 leak into the environment occurred after 1998 3 from the containment sumps in the vicinity of the 4 dispenser area?</p> <p>5 A. We don't have any post '98 soil 6 sampling results from underneath the dispensers. 7 So we have identified some instances when there 8 were releases from within the dispenser cabinet. 9 I'm not able to establish whether those releases 10 were successfully contained or whether they made 11 it into the environment.</p> <p>12 Q. For the period prior to 1998, do 13 you have any maintenance records indicating that 14 maintenance was performed and leaks were observed 15 at the dispensers at the Red Triangle facility?</p> <p>16 MS. O'REILLY: Asked and answered.</p> <p>17 A. This was leaks in dispensers and 18 piping?</p> <p>19 Q. It's for the period 19 -- prior to 20 1998, do you have any records indicating that 21 maintenance was performed and leaks were observed 22 at the dispensers at the Red Triangle facility?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And what records do you have?</p> <p>25 A. If we look at the document listing,</p>
Page 187	Page 189
<p>1 an inspection in August of 2000 where evidence of 2 fuel releases were found in the dispenser 3 containment sumps with an active leak in one 4 dispenser.</p> <p>5 Are the dispenser containment sumps 6 referred to on Page 5 of 6 of your report for the 7 Red Triangle facility under pan -- pardon me -- 8 under dispenser pans which contain leaks from the 9 dispensers and prevent them from entering the 10 environment?</p> <p>11 MS. O'REILLY: Assumes facts, lacks 12 foundation. Go ahead.</p> <p>13 A. The purpose of a dispenser pan is 14 to capture releases from the -- any of the 15 dispenser components above the dispenser pan. 16 It's not uncommon for dispenser pans to not be 17 liquid tight, even though that's what they're 18 suppose to do. In cases such as this, I would 19 look for testing records that would establish the 20 integrity of the dispenser pan. In this 21 particular case, we were not able to find or we 22 did not have any testing records for the 23 containment sump, so we don't know whether that 24 sump was liquid tight or not.</p> <p>25 Q. With regard to the opinions you've</p>	<p>1 Page 11 of 22, the bottom entry.</p> <p>2 Q. I'm with you.</p> <p>3 A. There's an indication that there 4 was a leak in a union at a sump found as well as 5 the plug above the impact valve, the bottom 6 language.</p> <p>7 Q. And this is in August of 1998?</p> <p>8 A. I have it as June of '98.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay.</p> <p>10 A. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. 11 Yeah, the general entry is June of '98, but the 12 specific reference appears to be an August '98 13 event.</p> <p>14 Q. And the August '98 event that's 15 described is for a release of diesel product; am 16 I correct?</p> <p>17 A. That specific incident was for 18 diesel, that's correct.</p> <p>19 Q. Are there any records of 20 maintenance having occurred at the facility prior 21 to 19 -- in or prior to 1998 which indicated that 22 leaks were observed in the dispensers with 23 gasoline being the product released?</p> <p>24 MS. O'REILLY: Asked and answered.</p> <p>25 A. For the period 1998 and before,</p>

48 (Pages 186 to 189)

Marcel G. Moreau

Page 198	Page 200
<p>1 Q. Is there any evidence to indicate</p> <p>2 that the tanks at the Red Triangle facility prior</p> <p>3 to 1998 failed a integrity test?</p> <p>4 A. All the test records that we</p> <p>5 reviewed from the 1990's had a passing test</p> <p>6 result.</p> <p>7 Q. With respect to the tanks installed</p> <p>8 in '98, were there any tests indicating that the</p> <p>9 post '98 tank field experience, or post '98 tanks</p> <p>10 experienced any failures of integrity tests?</p> <p>11 MS. O'REILLY: Vague and ambiguous.</p> <p>12 A. I believe the only test results we</p> <p>13 have were the installation testing of the tanks,</p> <p>14 and it appears the tanks passed the tests in</p> <p>15 September of '98.</p> <p>16 Q. Prior to 1998, are there any</p> <p>17 documents indicating that any of the product</p> <p>18 lines or associated equipment failed an integrity</p> <p>19 test?</p> <p>20 A. Prior to 1998, there's no</p> <p>21 indication of a failed tightness test on the</p> <p>22 lines. That test would not have included, most</p> <p>23 likely would not have included the STPs or the</p> <p>24 dispensers, however.</p> <p>25 Q. With regard to the period after</p>	<p>1 evidence, I don't think I have -- I don't have an</p> <p>2 opinion as to whether or not there were releases</p> <p>3 from the post-'98 storage system.</p> <p>4 Q. Was there any evidence that you</p> <p>5 reviewed in this case that prior to 1998 there</p> <p>6 was documentation indicating there were repairs</p> <p>7 or replacement of a leaking STP at the Red</p> <p>8 Triangle station?</p> <p>9 MS. O'REILLY: Same objections,</p> <p>10 vague and ambiguous.</p> <p>11 A. There were few, if any, what I</p> <p>12 would call maintenance or repair records present</p> <p>13 in the file for the pre-1998 period, so I don't</p> <p>14 have any specific repair records, but releases</p> <p>15 from STPs are fairly common occurrences.</p> <p>16 Q. Did you see any URR reporting that</p> <p>17 there had been a release from any STP prior to</p> <p>18 1998 at the Red Triangle facility?</p> <p>19 MS. O'REILLY: Assumes facts. Go</p> <p>20 ahead.</p> <p>21 A. I believe I've already indicated</p> <p>22 that we don't have any URRs for the Red Triangle</p> <p>23 facility, at least not in the documents that we</p> <p>24 reviewed. That doesn't mean that releases didn't</p> <p>25 occur, just that they weren't reported.</p>
Page 199	Page 201
<p>1 1998 and the new tanks were installed, were there</p> <p>2 any tests indicating that the product lines</p> <p>3 failed an integrity test after 1998?</p> <p>4 A. It appears they may have had some</p> <p>5 issues passing the original tightness test in</p> <p>6 September of '98, but I don't believe we have any</p> <p>7 tightness test results after that date.</p> <p>8 Q. Based on your review of the records</p> <p>9 in this case, is it your opinion that there was a</p> <p>10 release from the new tank system with secondary</p> <p>11 containment installed after 1998?</p> <p>12 MS. O'REILLY: Vague and ambiguous,</p> <p>13 overbroad.</p> <p>14 A. I don't believe we have any soil</p> <p>15 information, soil contaminant, or let me see. We</p> <p>16 don't have any soil samples taken after 1998 from</p> <p>17 relevant areas that would reveal whether there</p> <p>18 were post-1998 releases, so I can't say whether</p> <p>19 or not we have evidence of that.</p> <p>20 Q. Is it your opinion, though, that</p> <p>21 there were releases from the 1998 installed tank</p> <p>22 system?</p> <p>23 MS. O'REILLY: Asked and answered.</p> <p>24 Go ahead.</p> <p>25 A. I would say given the lack of</p>	<p>1 Q. With regard to the STPs prior to</p> <p>2 1998, when the tank system was replaced, was</p> <p>3 there any documentation of the removal of</p> <p>4 contaminated or saturated soils in the vicinity</p> <p>5 of the STPs at this facility?</p> <p>6 MS. O'REILLY: Vague and ambiguous.</p> <p>7 A. We have a statement that some</p> <p>8 petroleum hydrocarbon odors were noted from the</p> <p>9 tank pit at the west end of the pit under the</p> <p>10 gasoline tanks, and this is for the December 28th</p> <p>11 UST removal report, so this is the tank that was</p> <p>12 removed in December of '98. What I don't have</p> <p>13 is, or at least I'm not recalling whether I have</p> <p>14 a diagram that indicates which end of the tanks</p> <p>15 the STPs for that particular tank field were</p> <p>16 located. So we have indications of contamination</p> <p>17 at one end of the tanks. I would need do some</p> <p>18 research to determine whether that was the STP --</p> <p>19 whether that was the end of the tanks where the</p> <p>20 STPs were located.</p> <p>21 Q. And looking at your report, there</p> <p>22 are some 1998 graphics for the Red Triangle</p> <p>23 facility, and specifically we are referring to</p> <p>24 RWQCB-FRESNO-009928 and 009936.</p> <p>25 Are those the only graphics that</p>

51 (Pages 198 to 201)

Marcel G. Moreau

Page 202	Page 204
<p>1 you have from Parker Environmental or any other</p> <p>2 consultant or agency illustrating the location of</p> <p>3 the tanks at the Red Triangle facility that were</p> <p>4 removed in December 1998?</p> <p>5 MS. O'REILLY: Vague and ambiguous,</p> <p>6 overbroad. Go ahead.</p> <p>7 A. I would say those are probably not</p> <p>8 the only graphics. Having gone through this</p> <p>9 exercise in other cases, I determined that it</p> <p>10 would be helpful to have some diagrams when we</p> <p>11 were going through our deposition, and so as I</p> <p>12 was reviewing documents, I would select out</p> <p>13 graphics, primarily ones that showed soil sample</p> <p>14 locations. So these are just not quite random,</p> <p>15 but they're selections of the graphics that were</p> <p>16 available.</p> <p>17 If I were trying to identify the</p> <p>18 location of an STP, I would first start with some</p> <p>19 of the tank test records that we have, 'cause</p> <p>20 those often times include a diagram of the site</p> <p>21 and would indicate where the STPs might be</p> <p>22 located.</p> <p>23 Q. And do you have any of those in</p> <p>24 your collection of documents that reflect the</p> <p>25 location of the submerged turbine pumps on this</p>	<p>1 first diagram.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. I got it.</p> <p>3 A. You got it?</p> <p>4 Q. That would be RWQCB-FRESNO-010508?</p> <p>5 A. Correct. So my understanding of</p> <p>6 this facility is that in the lower left corner of</p> <p>7 that diagram there was essentially a retail fuel</p> <p>8 facility that contained some storage tanks and</p> <p>9 dispensers, and then sort of in the middle of</p> <p>10 that diagram there's a dotted line that says</p> <p>11 "Former UST Locations," and those would be the</p> <p>12 ones that contained gasoline, diesel, and I think</p> <p>13 weed oil in one of those tanks. I believe the</p> <p>14 releases from the tanks that I was describing</p> <p>15 earlier are the ones from the non-retail side of</p> <p>16 the facility, the ones that would be in the</p> <p>17 middle of that diagram. So in my mind, they were</p> <p>18 distinguished as retail and non-retail.</p> <p>19 Q. And the non-retail were used for</p> <p>20 fueling a fleet of vehicles?</p> <p>21 A. It was never clear to me what they</p> <p>22 were used for. They didn't particularly appear</p> <p>23 to be associated with dispensers. I couldn't</p> <p>24 quite determine what exactly those tanks were</p> <p>25 used for, whether this was a bulk plant of some</p>
Page 203	Page 205
<p>1 particular tank field?</p> <p>2 MS. O'REILLY: Asked and answered.</p> <p>3 Go head.</p> <p>4 A. They may be present in my hard</p> <p>5 drive, but I would need to go look them up.</p> <p>6 Q. And with respect to the reference</p> <p>7 to this particular facility and tank field, are</p> <p>8 you talking about the UST removal at 2808 South</p> <p>9 Chestnut or are you referring to the removal at</p> <p>10 the adjacent facility? 'Cause there were two,</p> <p>11 correct?</p> <p>12 MS. O'REILLY: Okay. There are</p> <p>13 two, Bill, but I think they're at the same</p> <p>14 address. Why don't you have him explain his</p> <p>15 report.</p> <p>16 Q. More importantly, it's just when</p> <p>17 you made reference to this notation, do you know</p> <p>18 which tank field they were talking about, was it</p> <p>19 the one just with the gasoline tanks or is it the</p> <p>20 location where they had a combination of kerosene</p> <p>21 and diesel and gasoline?</p> <p>22 A. If you look just a couple pages</p> <p>23 ahead.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay.</p> <p>25 A. There's a diagram right -- the very</p>	<p>1 kind or a repackaging facility of some kind or</p> <p>2 what was going on.</p> <p>3 Q. With regard to the Red Triangle</p> <p>4 facility, did you have any information by which</p> <p>5 you could estimate the volume of gasoline sold at</p> <p>6 this facility prior to 1998 on an annual basis?</p> <p>7 A. From the retail or non-retail or</p> <p>8 either?</p> <p>9 Q. Either.</p> <p>10 A. Based on my recent review of the</p> <p>11 document listing, it doesn't appear that -- oh,</p> <p>12 wait a minute.</p> <p>13 We had some inventory quarterly,</p> <p>14 the quarterly inventory reconciliation documents</p> <p>15 that were submitted in the early '90s for this</p> <p>16 facility. I would go there first to see if they</p> <p>17 had some through-put information, but I don't</p> <p>18 have any on the top of my head.</p> <p>19 Q. With respect to the work that you</p> <p>20 did in this case, did you determine what the</p> <p>21 allowable stock loss tolerance would be for the</p> <p>22 tanks that were in use at the facility prior to</p> <p>23 1998, either retail or non-retail?</p> <p>24 A. What the inventory tolerance might</p> <p>25 be?</p>

52 (Pages 202 to 205)

Marcel G. Moreau

Page 765	Page 767
<p>1 we have would point to submersible pumps and  2 deliveries. The record really is silent about what  3 was happening in the middle of the tanks. So we can  4 definitely identify submersibles and delivery  5 spills, and we don't really have enough information  6 to say whether tank top fittings may have been an  7 additional source of release or not.  8 BY MR. PÉREZ:  9 Q. On page 2 of 4 in the February 18th,  10 1999 entry, you mentioned product line trenches, and  11 indicate that no analytes were detected in the simple  12 sample collected -- in the single sample collected,  13 excuse me, at 3 feet bgs. Do you see that?  14 A. I see that, yes.  15 Q. Is it your opinion that the product  16 lines are not a potential source of releases at  17 Beacon 3519?  18 MS. O'REILLY: Misstates the document.  19 Vague and ambiguous.  20 THE WITNESS: No. It would be my opinion  21 that, based on a single soil sample, there was no  22 contamination associated with that particular  23 location of the piping. There were other locations  24 along the piping where samples might have been taken  25 but were not.</p>	<p>1 this site?  2 A. The Facility Summary doesn't describe  3 any specific spill events that we discovered in  4 reviewing the documents associated with this site.  5 So we don't have a -- any documentation of a specific  6 spill event.  7 Q. If the customer spill section reads  8 as this one does for this site, as many of them do  9 for other sites, can we assume from this -- from  10 these two sentences, that you have used with respect  11 to many sites, that you found no documentation in  12 your document review that indicated the occurrence of  13 a specific customer spill or a spill during vehicle  14 fueling activities at the site?  15 MS. O'REILLY: Vague and ambiguous.  16 Misstates testimony.  17 Go ahead.  18 THE WITNESS: I believe that would generally  19 be correct. That if we found documentation of a  20 specific spill, it was certainly our intent to  21 include it in this section of the report.  22 And so if there is no -- there are no  23 references to specific spills, then I think it's a  24 fair -- it's fair to conclude that we did not find  25 any specific documentation relative to spills in the</p>
Page 766	Page 768
<p>1 So the record we have doesn't point to  2 piping releases, but I wouldn't offer the opinion  3 that there were no piping releases from this site.  4 BY MR. PÉREZ:  5 Q. Would your answer to the question of  6 when the earliest release of MTBE -- or MTBE gasoline  7 occurred at the site be the same as it was when I  8 asked the same question regarding 5th Wheel?  9 MS. O'REILLY: Vague and ambiguous.  10 Go ahead.  11 THE WITNESS: Yes, it would. But the --  12 that customer spillage is a routine event and  13 probably would have -- would have begun to occur very  14 shortly after the first load of MTBE gasoline was  15 delivered to the site.  16 BY MR. PÉREZ:  17 Q. And would you answer that question  18 the same way for the remaining sites that we're  19 discussing?  20 A. Unless we have reference to a  21 specific spill, I believe -- at some of these other  22 sites, then I believe the answer would be the same.  23 Q. With respect to the customer spills,  24 do you have any information indicating the occurrence  25 of a small spill during vehicle fueling activities at</p>	<p>1 documents that we reviewed.  2 BY MR. PÉREZ:  3 Q. Did you evaluate for this site  4 whether any off-site source contributed to the  5 presence of MTBE at the site?  6 MS. O'REILLY: Assumes facts. Lacks  7 foundation.  8 THE WITNESS: For our purposes, we were just  9 trying to determine whether the facilities at this  10 site had had a release. There is ample evidence of  11 soil contamination immediately adjacent to the tank  12 and dispenser components at this site and well above  13 the water table. So we did not investigate whether  14 there might have been an off-site contribution to the  15 groundwater contamination at this site.  16 BY MR. PÉREZ:  17 Q. On page 3 of 4 in the March 15th,  18 2004 entry you mention a well, City of Fresno  19 Municipal Well 30A that's located about 600 feet west  20 of the site, correct?  21 A. That's the general content of that  22 sentence, yes.  23 Q. You don't have any opinions regarding  24 whether contamination from this site or any other  25 site impacted or threatens to impact any particular</p>

17 (Pages 765 to 768)

Marcel G. Moreau

Page 773	Page 775
<p>1 California gasoline.</p> <p>2 So June of '98 would be the last time or the</p> <p>3 last event where evidence of a release was</p> <p>4 discovered -- of gasoline that contained MTBE.</p> <p>5 BY MR. PÉREZ:</p> <p>6 Q. And with respect to the January of</p> <p>7 2009 and January 2010 releases that you just</p> <p>8 mentioned, you state for both of those, quote, "This</p> <p>9 release likely did not contribute to the MTBE</p> <p>10 contamination at this facility," closed quote.</p> <p>11 Correct?</p> <p>12 A. Well, the first part of that sentence</p> <p>13 is, "MTBE should not have been present in California</p> <p>14 motor fuel in 2010." One of them should have said</p> <p>15 209 (sic).</p> <p>16 So this release likely did not contribute to</p> <p>17 the MTBE contamination at this facility, that's</p> <p>18 correct.</p> <p>19 Q. And this is a case where in the</p> <p>20 "Customer Spill" section you do mention a specific</p> <p>21 customer release occurring in August of 2005,</p> <p>22 correct?</p> <p>23 A. That is correct.</p> <p>24 Q. And that was also after the time that</p> <p>25 MTBE was no longer in use in California gasoline,</p>	<p>1 other to have been the source of the release?</p> <p>2 MS. O'REILLY: Vague and ambiguous.</p> <p>3 Overbroad.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: In general, I would say that</p> <p>5 the submersible pump and adjacent piping is likely --</p> <p>6 is more likely to be a significant source of release</p> <p>7 or a more significant source than a delivery spill.</p> <p>8 I need to go and look up the soil sample</p> <p>9 results, if you wanted to get more specific than that</p> <p>10 for this specific site.</p> <p>11 MR. PÉREZ: Not necessary.</p> <p>12 Q. For all -- for any of the releases</p> <p>13 that you discussed in the "Identification of MTBE</p> <p>14 Releases" section, were you able to calculate the</p> <p>15 volume of the release?</p> <p>16 A. At this site?</p> <p>17 Q. Yes.</p> <p>18 MS. O'REILLY: Vague and ambiguous.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: Except for the customer spill</p> <p>20 in August of 2005, the volume released was not able</p> <p>21 to be determined for the other release incident or</p> <p>22 for the evidence of releases that was discovered at</p> <p>23 various times.</p> <p>24 BY MR. PEREZ:</p> <p>25 Q. Were you able to determine the</p>
Page 774	Page 776
<p>1 right?</p> <p>2 A. It should not have been present in</p> <p>3 the gasoline, that's correct.</p> <p>4 Q. For this site did you consider the</p> <p>5 possibility that any off-site source could have</p> <p>6 contributed to the presence of MTBE at the site?</p> <p>7 A. Again, the thrust of our</p> <p>8 investigation was to determine whether releases had</p> <p>9 occurred at the storage systems at this particular</p> <p>10 site.</p> <p>11 In this particular case, there was ample</p> <p>12 evidence of soil contamination immediately adjacent</p> <p>13 to the storage systems, well above the water table.</p> <p>14 So I did not feel the need to investigate whether</p> <p>15 off-site sources of contamination may have</p> <p>16 contributed to the contamination at this site.</p> <p>17 Q. On page 4 of 5, with respect to the</p> <p>18 June of 1998 release discussed in the last paragraph;</p> <p>19 do you see that?</p> <p>20 A. I do.</p> <p>21 Q. You mention possible sources of that</p> <p>22 release being delivery spills or leaks from the</p> <p>23 submersible pump or adjacent piping. Do you have any</p> <p>24 opinion with respect to which of those two possible</p> <p>25 sources that you mention is more likely than the</p>	<p>1 duration of any of the releases that you identified</p> <p>2 for this site?</p> <p>3 A. For the active release discovered in</p> <p>4 June of '94, the statement in the report is that,</p> <p>5 "When the leak began is not known." So we were not</p> <p>6 able to establish a start point for that release.</p> <p>7 And then for the other evidence of releases,</p> <p>8 the statement is that the releases were likely</p> <p>9 intermittent.</p> <p>10 Q. On page 3 of 5, September --</p> <p>11 September 27th, 1998 entry you note that, "The Tank</p> <p>12 Closure Report indicated that the tanks removed were</p> <p>13 in good condition and there were no holes or pitting</p> <p>14 observed in any of the USTs." Do you see that?</p> <p>15 A. I see that, yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Does that indicate to you that there</p> <p>17 was never a release from the tanks themselves at this</p> <p>18 site?</p> <p>19 MS. O'REILLY: Vague and ambiguous.</p> <p>20 Overbroad.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: As I've discussed before, the</p> <p>22 type of observations that are made during tank</p> <p>23 removal are typically very cursory. So I take this</p> <p>24 to be an indication that there was no obvious holes</p> <p>25 in the tank from the outside.</p>

19 (Pages 773 to 776)



Marcel G. Moreau

Page 777	Page 779
<p>1 I would point out that internal corrosion</p> <p>2 holes are very difficult to spot. So the indications</p> <p>3 are that there were no holes observed when these</p> <p>4 tanks were removed. I wouldn't go so far to say that</p> <p>5 the tanks themselves never leaked.</p> <p>6 BY MR. PÉREZ:</p> <p>7 Q. Let's go on to the next site, please,</p> <p>8 which is Fresno Valley Gas. If you could look at the</p> <p>9 Site Specific Report you prepared for that site.</p> <p>10 It's located at 2139 South Elm Street in Fresno.</p> <p>11 A. I have that.</p> <p>12 Q. Looking at the "Identification of</p> <p>13 MTBE Releases" section, would you agree that among</p> <p>14 the releases discussed here in both the "Tank Area</p> <p>15 Releases" and the "Piping and Dispenser Area</p> <p>16 Releases" section, for those releases prior to 1992,</p> <p>17 none of those contributed to the presence of MTBE at</p> <p>18 the site; is that correct?</p> <p>19 MS. O'REILLY: Misstates the document.</p> <p>20 Vague and ambiguous.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: There's several actual release</p> <p>22 incidents -- or active releases that were discovered</p> <p>23 in the time period before 1992. And the statement</p> <p>24 associated with those in the report is that MTBE was</p> <p>25 not commonly present in California gasoline in --</p>	<p>1 release incidents, I was not able to determine the</p> <p>2 start of the release for any of those incidents that</p> <p>3 were identified.</p> <p>4 With regard to the evidence of a release</p> <p>5 provided by soil contamination, the report states</p> <p>6 that the releases were likely intermittent.</p> <p>7 BY MR. PÉREZ:</p> <p>8 Q. And were you able to identify the</p> <p>9 source for any of the releases you identified in this</p> <p>10 section for this site?</p> <p>11 A. There were a number of sources</p> <p>12 identified. Do you want to go through the list?</p> <p>13 Q. Sure.</p> <p>14 A. In August of '89, the unleaded</p> <p>15 turbine pump was observed to be leaking. A fill</p> <p>16 riser was found to be leaking in April of 1992. The</p> <p>17 specific tank is not identified. Piping and</p> <p>18 dispensers 4 and 6 were observed to be leaking in</p> <p>19 August of '89.</p> <p>20 A piping leak was identified in the Premium</p> <p>21 dispenser in October of 1990. A piping leak in a</p> <p>22 dispenser riser, the particular dispenser is not</p> <p>23 identified, was observed in April of 1992. A leak in</p> <p>24 the Unleaded piping was repaired in August of 1999.</p> <p>25 A piping leak near the southern dispenser islands was</p>
Page 778	Page 780
<p>1 insert the appropriate date -- but it would be before</p> <p>2 the fall of 1992. So it's unlikely that this release</p> <p>3 contributed to the MTBE contamination at this</p> <p>4 facility.</p> <p>5 So without having specific information about</p> <p>6 a gasoline supplier, sort of the default opinion is</p> <p>7 that a release of MTBE was unlikely prior to the fall</p> <p>8 of '92.</p> <p>9 BY MR. PÉREZ:</p> <p>10 Q. For any of the releases discussed in</p> <p>11 the "Identification of MTBE Releases" section for</p> <p>12 this site, were you able to determine the volume of</p> <p>13 the release?</p> <p>14 MS. O'REILLY: Asked and answered. Vague</p> <p>15 and ambiguous.</p> <p>16 Go ahead.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: A specific volume for any of</p> <p>18 the releases or any of the evidence of releases that</p> <p>19 was discovered could not be determined with the</p> <p>20 documentation that was provided.</p> <p>21 BY MR. PÉREZ:</p> <p>22 Q. Were you able to determine the</p> <p>23 duration of any of these releases?</p> <p>24 MS. O'REILLY: Same objections.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: With regard to the actual</p>	<p>1 repaired in November of '99.</p> <p>2 I think that's it for the actual releases</p> <p>3 that were identified.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you have any opinions regarding</p> <p>5 the occurrence of a release at this site between the</p> <p>6 fall of 1992 and August of 1999?</p> <p>7 MS. O'REILLY: Vague. Ambiguous.</p> <p>8 Overbroad.</p> <p>9 BY MR. PÉREZ:</p> <p>10 Q. If you look on page 4 of 5, just to</p> <p>11 help you answer the question. Under the "Piping and</p> <p>12 Dispenser Area Releases," the third paragraph talks</p> <p>13 about a spill in April of 1992. And you have stated</p> <p>14 earlier that MTBE was not commonly present in</p> <p>15 California gasoline beginning in the fall of 1992,</p> <p>16 correct?</p> <p>17 And the next paragraph talks about a release</p> <p>18 or a line leak repair in August of '89.</p> <p>19 So in between those two incidents, do you</p> <p>20 have any opinion regarding the occurrence of any</p> <p>21 release in that time frame?</p> <p>22 MS. O'REILLY: Vague. Ambiguous.</p> <p>23 Overbroad. Asked and answered.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: The documented release</p> <p>25 incidents are -- or there's a gap in the documented</p>

20 (Pages 777 to 780)